

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

REMARKS

JUN 12 2007

Claims 1-4, 7, 14-15, and 19-20 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-7, 14, 15, and 19-20, at paragraph 3 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,931,249 ("Fors") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0218575 ("Ibe"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

None of the cited references, including Fors and Ibe, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, Fors does not disclose receiving an internet protocol address associated with a wireless local area network base station, as recited in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, Fors discloses that a dual mode mobile phone, capable of communicating with both a cellular network and a Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN), establishes contact with a WLAN Access Point (AP), which involves obtaining an IP address for the mobile phone. See Fors, col. 5, lines 64-65. Further, Ibe does not disclose this element of claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, Ibe discloses a mobile device that uses Session Initiation Protocol based Voice over IP (VoIP) in conjunction with a Cellular Controller to create a proxy for a user's mobile device in a cellular carrier's network. See Ibe, paragraph 0038. Therefore, Fors and Ibe, separately or in combination do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-4, 7, and 19-20 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, Fors and Ibe fail to disclose at least one element of each of claims 2-4, 7, and 19-20. Accordingly, claims 2-4, 7, and 19-20 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Further, the dependent claims recite features not disclosed by the cited references. For example, Ibe does not disclose that an internet protocol (IP) address associated with a WLAN base station is communicated to a mobile phone using a dynamic host configuration protocol, as recited in claim 4. Instead, Ibe discloses that after a laptop computer has been successfully

authenticated, the laptop obtains its own IP address through a DHCP server. *See Ibe*, paragraph 0042. For this additional reason, claim 4 is allowable.

None of the cited references, including Fors and Ibe, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 14. For example, Fors does not disclose a memory to store an internet protocol (IP) address associated with a wireless local area network base station and received by the mobile phone from the wireless local area network (WLAN), as recited in claim 14. Instead, Fors discloses that a dual mode mobile phone, capable of communicating with both cellular network and WLAN, establishes contact with a WLAN Access Point (AP), which involves obtaining an IP address for the mobile phone itself. *See Fors*, col. 5, lines 64-65. Thus, in Fors, the IP address is obtained for the mobile phone itself, and is not an IP address associated with a WLAN. Further, Ibe does not disclose this element of claim 14. Instead, Ibe discloses a data handoff scheme in which a mobile node has a permanent IP address. *See Ibe*, paragraph 0006. Ibe also discloses use of a Cellular Controller to proxy for a dual mode (802.11 and cellular) mobile device, with the mobile device in the 802.11 mode. In conjunction with the Cellular Controller, the mobile device uses Session Initiation Protocol based Voice over IP (VoIP) and the Cellular Controller creates a proxy for the user's mobile device in the cellular carrier's network. *See Ibe*, paragraph 0038. Therefore, Fors and Ibe, separately or in combination do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 14. Hence, claim 14 is allowable.

Claim 15 depends from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, Fors and Ibe fail to disclose at least one element of claim 15. Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 14.

Further, the dependent claims recite features not disclosed by the cited references. For example, Fors does not disclose or suggest a mobile phone device, including a wide area cellular communications module and a short-range wireless local area network module, that are computer software modules integrated within a digital processor device, as recited in claim 15. Instead, Fors discloses a dual mode mobile station that includes a processor, a dual-mode transmitter and a dual-mode receiver. *See Fors*, col. 3, line 67 – col. 4, line 2. However, Fors does not disclose a wide area cellular communications module and a short range WLAN module that are software

modules. Further, Ibe does not disclose or suggest this element of claim 15. In contrast to claim 15, Ibe does not disclose software modules. Instead, Ibe discloses a dual mode mobile device, but does not disclose software modules within the mobile device. *See* Ibe, paragraph 0038. Ibe also discloses a Cellular Controller not included in the mobile device that acts as a proxy for the dual mode mobile device to the cellular network with the mobile device in 802.11 mode. *See* Ibe, paragraphs 0038-0039, and Fig. 1. For this additional reason, claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 5-6 and 18 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 5-6 and 18, at paragraph 4 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Fors in view of Ibe, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0217180 (“Chandra”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As explained above, Fors and Ibe do not disclose each of the elements of claim 1. Chandra does not disclose the elements of claim 1 that are not disclosed by Fors and Ibe. For example, Chandra does not disclose receiving an internet protocol address associated with a wireless local area network base station, as recited in claim 1. Chandra discloses an address allocated to the mobile node via, e.g., a DHCP server. *See* Chandra, paragraph 0027-0030. Thus, in contrast to claim 1, the mobile node of Chandra does not use a forwarding address of a WLAN base station, but instead is assigned its own address. Therefore, Fors, Ibe, and Chandra, separately or in combination, do not disclose each of the elements of claim 1, or of claims 5-6, which depend from claim 1.

Further, Chandra does not disclose determining that a mobile phone has moved out of range of a WLAN base station, and sending a message to a cellular network element to cancel call forwarding to the WLAN base station, as recited in claim 5. Instead, Chandra discloses that a mobile node manages its home address by requesting a home address from a home agent and receiving a registration reply with an allocated home address. *See* Chandra, paragraph 0016. Further, the Office Action admits that Fors and Ibe do not disclose this element of claim 5. *See* Office Action, paragraph 4. Therefore, Fors, Ibe, and Chandra fail to disclose or suggest each

and every element of claim 5. Accordingly, claim 5 is allowable. Claim 6 depends from claim 5, and is therefore allowable at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 5.

Further, Chandra fails to disclose or suggest that the wide area cellular network sends a call directly to the mobile phone over a cellular spectrum after the mobile phone has moved out of range of the wireless local area network base station, as recited in claim 6. In contrast to claim 6, Chandra discloses a system for DHCP based home address management of mobile IP clients. *See Chandra, Abstract.* Chandra does not disclose sending a call over a cellular spectrum. Further, the Office Action admits that Fors and Ibe do not disclose this element of claim 6. *See Office Action, paragraph 4.* Therefore, the combination of Fors, Ibe, and Chandra fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 6. For this additional reason, claim 6 is allowable.

As explained above, Fors and Ibe do not disclose each of the elements of claim 14. Chandra does not disclose the elements of claim 14 that are not disclosed by Fors and Ibe. For example, Chandra does not disclose a memory to store an internet protocol (IP) address associated with a wireless local area network base station and received by the mobile phone from the wireless local area network (WLAN), as recited in claim 14. Instead, Chandra discloses that a mobile node is assigned a home address by, e.g., a DHCP server. *See Chandra, paragraph 0030.* Therefore, Fors, Ibe and Chandra, separately or in combination, do not disclose each of the elements of claim 14, or of claim 18, which depends from claim 14.

Further, Chandra fails to disclose or suggest a mobile device where a wide area cellular communication module formulates a message to cancel a previously communicated call forwarding message to be sent to a remote wide area cellular network, as disclosed in claim 18. In contrast to claim 18, Chandra discloses sending messages via Internet and/or WAN. *See Chandra, paragraph 0005, 0014, and 0027.* Chandra does not disclose sending out messages over a wide area cellular network. Further, the Office Action admits that Fors and Ibe do not disclose this element of claim 18. *See Office Action, paragraph 4.* Therefore, the combination of Fors, Ibe and Chandra fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 18. Accordingly, claim 18 is allowable.

JUN. 12. 2007 5:58PM

TOLER SCHAFFER

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 696 P. 11

JUN 12 2007

Attorney Docket No.: 1033-SS00355

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

6-12-2007
Date


Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicants
TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P.
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)

JGT/SIE